DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 596 EA 021 093

AUTHOR Yates, Lyn
TITLE Gender, Ethnicity and the 'Inclusive' Curriculum: Some Contending Australian Frameworks of Policy and Research.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Distribution; *Ethnicity; *Ethnic Studies; *Females; Foreign Countries; Sex; *Sex Differences; Social Integration
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

This document discusses one specific aspect of gender/ethnicity/race developments in Australia: the way in which ethnicity and race have been addressed within policy and theorizing specifically concerned with girls and schooling. First, general points of orientation concerning the Australian context are discussed. Next, the development of policy and practice concerning girls is presented, followed by a definition of an inclusive curriculum and a historical framework for research on ethnicity and gender. Lastly, implications of the Australian use of the inclusive curriculum concept are assessed, both at a policy level and in terms of the frameworks of research that have been discussed. (27 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308596

Gender, Ethnicity and the 'Inclusive' Curriculum: Some Contending Australian Frameworks of Policy and Research

Lyn Yates
School of Education
La Trobe University
Bundoora, Vic.3083
Australia.

Paper delivered to AERA Annual Conference, San Francisco, March 1989.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lyn Yates

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 093

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In Australia as in many other countries, attention to girls and schooling has been a new development in the discussion of inequality of the last two decades. Over this time, policies and strategies for change have taken somewhat different forms in Australia as compared with comparable countries.(1) This paper is concerned with an analysis of one aspect of the Australian context of debate: the extent to which and the manner in which ethnicity and race have been addressed in the analysis of gender and inequality.

It should be noted here that I am not in this paper trying to provide a general analysis of gender and ethnicity in Australian schooling. Issues of class, of race as distinct from ethnicity, and of the overall work on ethnicity and multiculturalism in Australia are largely outside the scope of the present paper.(2) This does not mean that I consider these areas unimportant, and indeed, in previous work I have focussed much more extensively on gender and class. However in a recent paper I have argued that it is difficult to deal simultaneously with gender, ethnicity and class and that attempts to do so have usually been dominated by only one of these issues.(3) In that paper I presented a case as to why it is important to maintain some ongoing theorizing which considers each area as a distinct issue, as well as, of course, attending to how all three areas are formative in the life of an individual subject and their experience of schooling. What I am doing then in this paper is discussing one specific aspect of gender/ethnicity/race developments in Australia: the way in which ethnicity and race have been addressed <u>within</u> policy and theorizing specifically concerned with girls and schooling.

Background: The Australian Context

First, some general points of orientation. In Australia, schooling is organized at State-level rather than by the federal government. Schools and teachers are funded as part of each State public service, rather than by local communities. The extent to which the curriculum and other practices of schools are specified centrally varies between states. The Commonwealth Government (that is, the national Australian Government) has no direct powers in the organization of schooling but, since the 60s, has been able to influence school programmes in particular directions through the making available of extra funding tied to specific purposes. As well, through the commissioning of national reports, as well as by the setting up of national bodies for consultation and materials development (in particular, the Schools Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre), it has provided a further means to influence but not compel directions in school policy. In relation to gender, there have been many State Reports of Committees of Inquiry, as well as national ones.(4) In the discussion below however, for simplicity, I draw mainly on the national documents.

In terms of the composition of Australia's population, the colonial settlement of Australia and subsequent actions by European settlers decimated the indigenous population, the Australian Aborigines.(5) At the most recent census, Aborigines now number less than 250,000 out of a total Australian population of over 16 million. (It was only

following a referendum in 1967 that Aborigines were classified as 'Australian citizens' and counted in the census.) On all social indicators (poverty, life expectancy, participation rates in school and the workforce, imprisonment, etc.) Aborigines continue to occupy a position well outside the norms of Australia's population generally. In 1971 for example, only 3% of Aborigines had proceeded beyond year 10 at school. Today, in the most populous state, the retention rate of Aboriginal students to the final year of school is about 30% as compared with around 70% for the general population.

Traditional Aboriginal culture is fundamentally different from the western post-industrial, materialist culture of mainstream Australian society, and has a different concept of time, of spirituality, of possessions and of relations between people. This culture is heavily organized around a distinction between 'men's business' and 'women's business' which permeates authority structures, laws, ceremonies. Aboriginal women have generally argued that sexism is a problem in white Australian culture (and of the experience of Aboriginal girls and women in this culture) but not a consequence of the sexual division of labour in their own culture.

The composition of the non-indigenous Australian population has altered considerably since the second World War. Very large levels of post-war migration were encouraged to support Australia's industrial development. These immigrants were largely of European origin, from England, Italy and Greece in particular. A 'White Australia Policy' which excluded immigration from the countries of South East Asia which are closest to Australia operated until 1973. Since the abolition of the White Australia Policy, and in particular since the end of the Vietnam War, Australia has accepted significant numbers of Asian immigrants, from Vietnam in particular. It has also in recent decades taken larger proportions of immigrants from non-Christian religious backgrounds. Overall around 40% of Australia's population has at least one parent born overseas. First generation immigrants in particular occupy a large proportion of the lower paid jobs in Australia, in particular of factory work and of 'outwork' by women garment makers. As well people of non-Anglo-Celtic background are still notably under-represented in some of the more powerful and well-rewarded occupations, of which politics and academia are two examples. On the other hand, studies of school retention and tertiary success indicate that being of non English-speaking background overall does <u>not</u> produce lower success rates than those for the longer-established Australian population.(6) There are differences here between those of different nationality, and in terms of the later discussion in this paper, it is significant that those of Greek background have one of the highest proportions of students continuing to tertiary education.(7)

<u>The Development of Policy and Practice Concerning Girls</u>

In 1975, a Report of a national committee of inquiry into girls and inequality, <u>Girls, School and Society</u>, declared, 'Sexism in education is a contradiction in terms'. The Report set out ways in which schooling did not give girls the same importance and opportunities as

boys. In particular, it drew attention to the ways in which schooling channelled girls into a very narrow range of jobs; to a much smaller proportion of further and higher education than boys; and developed them in ways which did not give them the same confidence and ability to make choices in the world as boys. The Report suggested that what was of particular concern in the processes of schooling was the stereotyping of individuals according to their sex; the undermining of girls through the invisibility of women in the curriculum and the lack of encouragement to girls; and the inadequacy of the content of the curriculum in not teaching girls and boys about the realities of work and women s role in society.

Note that although this Report carefully set out statistics on various measures of inequality, it is apparent even in 1975 that the comparative school retention and participation rates of girls as compared with boys were not a major issue. Indeed, since 1976, a somewhat larger proportion of girls than of boys remain to the final year of schooling. To reiterate, the data presented in this major report make clear that although schooling contributes to the inequality of women in Australian society, it does so through the content and processes of schooling, that is, through the messages school teaches, rather than through an immediate 'cooling out' of girls as school failures on the model of class-based inequality. However there is some parallel to the 'cooling out' process in the careers advice and other processes by which girls are streamed away from mathematics and science. (Again, I am not implying that girls do not experience class-based processes of inequality, but trying to distinguish what the fate of girls as a group as compared with boys as a group looks like.)

In 1984, a subsequent Commonwealth Report, Girls and Tomorrow: The Challenge for Schools found that despite various funding programmes and school-level initiatives, little had actually changed in the outcomes of schooling for girls, and that the initiatives for change had been very patchy. This led in turn to some further Commonwealth funding of major projects investigating education and girls and, in 1987, to a new National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools. This policy recommended the need for action in schools under four headings:

I Raising awareness of the educational needs of girls;
II Equal access to and participation in appropriate curriculum;
III Supportive school environment;
IV Equitable resource allocation.

The policy also called for regular monitoring of what was being done and being achieved.

Where did matters of race and ethnicity fit into all this?

A comparison of the 1975 Report, Girls, School and Society with the 1987 National Policy shows a marked change in the way ethnicity and race are treated in the analysis of gender and inequality.(8) In the first report, attention to 'migrant women and girls' is enclosed in a separate chapter labelled 'Groups with Special Needs'. It is treated

as an 'add-on' problem of disadvantage, one which might involve special welfare considerations, but which is not part of the mainstream analysis of gender and schooling, or of the curriculum recommendations in relation to the education of girls. Indeed, the emphasis in this Report was on installing a new curriculum content, pedagogy and expectations which would apply to all students:

> There should be no distinction made between girls and boys in school curriculum or organisation, nor any sex-related expectations about behaviour, interests, capacities, personality traits or life patterns.(9)

By contrast, the opening chapter in the 1987 policy, somewhat unpromisingly titled 'Being a Girl in an Australian School', in fact deliberately relates anecdotes about many different types of girls, in many different settings. It makes clear that different situations of class, ethnicity, race, are part of what 'being a girl' is, and certainly are part of what needs to be taken into account when building a 'supportive school environment' or reforming curriculum ('to include the contribution of women, from all ethnic backgrounds and social groups'), or following through the other objectives set out in the Policy. Its 'policy framework' explicitly includes the need for the recognition of difference:

- Equality of opportunity and outcomes in education for girls and boys may require differential provision, at least for a period of time.
- Strategies to improve the quality of education for girls should be based on an understanding that girls are not a homogeneous group.
- To improve schooling for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander girls, school authorities will need to take account of the unique culture of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.
- The effective change and lasting improvements needed in schools will require awareness and understanding of the educational needs of girls on the part of students, parents, teachers and administrators, and instiutional support for addressing these needs.(10)

Now on one reading the types of changes that are seen in the 1987 Policy as compared with the 1975 Report might be seen as a clear line of progress, a response to complaints of marginalization from NESB women as well as a response to a point made in a whole range of the academic literature: that identical treatment of unequal groups does not necessarily bring about equal opportunity. The changes represent an explicit acknowledgement that getting rid of sexism in schooling involves more than excising obviously sexist textbooks and practices. it involves also a more fundamental attempt to re-orient mainstream schooling in a way that is 'inclusive' of all parts of society.

'Inclusive Curriculum'

In Australia, an interest in 'inclusive' curriculum can be seen in discussions, reforming projects and policy documents from the early 80s.(11) (It is by no means a uniform emphasis across the country.

and is most strongly seen in policies and projects in Victoria, South Australia, and those produced by the national Curriculum Development Centre). In principle, the 'inclusive curriculum' development refers both to pedagogical practice and to the principles framing curriculum content. Schools and teachers should be sensitive to the backgrounds, values and preferences of the variety of students they teach, but as well the study of English, social studies, mathematics, science, etc. should explicitly reflect a subject content derived from divergent cultural backgrounds, not only a dominant monoculture.

But what does it mean to be 'inclusive' of both gender and ethnicity (let alone class)? And how does this new rhetoric of policy relate to developments in practice?

Frameworks of Research

Until the 80s, the Australian discussion of ethnicity and of gender in relation to schooling largely remained separate. Indeed reviews of these two research fields up to 1985 (12) show how very little the two areas were interpreted as having common concerns or a common literature. As well, although it has become popular in recent times for sociological works on processes of inequality and schooling to deal with the triumvirate of class, sex and ethnicity together, as I have argued elsewhere (13), much of the inclusion of the latter two categories remains at the level of descriptive accounts of individuals, while the analysis and strategies for action in these works remain tied to the more long-standing issue of class (or 'socio-economic status').

In this part of the paper I want to outline three studies dealing with girls of Non-English speaking background (NESB) which have drawn considerable attention in the area of gender and schooling. Though in some respects overlapping, the three approaches suggest different frameworks for thinking about NESB girls and somewhat different directions for an 'inclusive' curriculum practice.

The first study, 'To Be Greek is to Be "Good"', by Maria Strintzos (14) analyzes the experience of girls of Greek background in terms of a 'culture clash' perspective. The study is based on extended interviews with girls of this background and of their parents in the home setting, and takes in students at government schools in a lower SES area, as well as girls attending a private single-sex school.

Strintzos argues that the process of transportation confirmed and strengthened Greek cultural traditions of an earlier period which are in considerable tension with the norms of Australian culture and schooling. These girls, through their families, are subject to a culture which actively values 'separate spheres' for men and women, heavy domestic responsibilities for girls, and a concept of family honour which heavily restricts the social life of the girls and promotes strong double standards for them as compared with male members of their family. On the other hand, in the school context, they are presented with different values which in the formal culture of the school relate to individual achievement and career

orientation,, and in the peer culture of the school relate to 'unguarded interaction'. Strintzos outlines a typology of responses by the Greek girls to this situation. She shows how for middle-class girls, career orientation may be incorporated, but without modifying a concept of femininity which stresses virtue, extreme femininity of appearance, and responsibility for domestic labour and general care of men. For other girls, she shows how a move to take up some 'Anglo' styles of leisure and free time, led to a labelling of the girls as 'bad', though they themselves had not rejected the general concepts of femininity and virtue of their families.

The perspectives used in this study draw on a set of sociological and feminist perspectives of cultural formation which are usually seen as progressive (that is, in sympathy with feminist concerns). They fit in with a wide range of research on schools which seeks to explore how the culture of schooling interacts with the cultural formation of individuals to produce ends other than those which are part of the formal rhetoric of schooling. Failure and early leaving are often stressed in studies which focus on class or race; studies of gender are concerned also with the weakening of women's self-confidence and self-esteem (which contributes to <u>later</u> educational and employment inequality). In terms of 'inclusive curriculum' discussions, such studies might hope to contribute to appreciating pressures specific to girls of this particular background, to understanding how school expectations may be conflictual for them. On the other hand, such approaches also have the potential for confirming and reinforcing teachers views of this group as 'disadvantaged', for explaining away any failure in what school achieves for these girls as due to factors outside schooling.(15) This problem is confronted in the quite different framework of research used in the next study to be outlined.

<u>Educating Voula</u> (16), possibly the best-known Australian work on girls of NESB background, resulted from a project funded by MACCME. Elsewhere, articles by Georgina Tsolidas, the author of this report, have expounded more fully on some of the perspectives informing the study.(17) In this study, the researcher took time-tabled classes with girls of NESB background, and explored with them their attitudes to a number of aspects of schooling. She also, but more briefly, raised similar issues with girls of ESB background and boys of ESB and NESB background in the same school, as well as talking to some of the parents of the girls who were the main subjects of her study.

The perspective taken by Tsolidas was an 'affirmative' one. That is, in her account a feminist position and one which draws pride from a non-'Anglo' background takes as a starting assumption that the NESB girls should not be seen as the problem. Instead, the views and values of these girls are taken as a standard against which the practices of the school in particular are found wanting. In Tsolidas' study, the girls are not portrayed as victims of a 'culture clash'. They are shown as knowledgeable active subjects, choosing which practices they will support. For example, in Australia, the difficulty of getting permission for 'NESB' girls to go on camps is often cited by teachers as an example of the sexism of their culture, as well as the culture clash between family culture and school. Tsolidas claimed however that the girls were concerned primarily about

getting a good (that is, rigorous, successful) education. If they saw excursions as of educational worth, they would present them as such to their parents and negotiate appropriate permission. However usually they saw the camps as an unnecessary distraction from the educational function of schooling, and used lack of permission as a means of avoiding them.

What Tsolidas' study emphasized was, firstly, the knowledge and skills possessed by the girls (their second language skills, as well as knowledge related to the migration process and of their country of origin). The research suggested that this knowledge was not shared to the same extent by the NESB boys, nor by the girls and boys of ESB. Tsolidas emphasized that by treating the girls as 'disadvantaged' rather than appreciating and building on their existing knowledge, school was limiting their education.

In comparison with the type of 'culture clash' outlined by Strintzos, Tsolidas proposes two alternative perspectives. First, it is not that notions of virginity, honour, etc. do not exist nor that these do not differ from Australian norms. But Tsolidas in her approach is disputing the heavy <u>emphasis</u> and <u>salience</u> granted these issues in discussions of NESB girls and schooling. For Tsolidas, these issues are not disabling ones for the girls. It is the job of school to make sure these girls are recognized as having potential for success in education, not to use a concern about their cultural customs as an excuse for confining them (in marginalized curriculum programmes) and for trying to make them conform to 'Anglo' norms.

Secondly, in relation to Australian schooling norms and the values and aspirations of the girls, Tsolidas trieds to show any 'clash' as a problem of what school is doing rather than of the girls not being able to take advantage of what school offers. In particular, from her interviews with the four categories of students, Tsolidas shows that the NESB girls have the greatest gap between their aspirations for career and further education (high) and their expectations of what they expect schooling to deliver (low). They are critical of what they see as 'slack' practices of schooling (informality, negotiated learning, lack of homework and competitive assessment, etc.).

Tsolidas' perspective is one which proposes an 'affirmative' approach. No matter how sensitive 'inclusive' pedagogy may be to the characteristics of different groups, if success and the content of schooling remain unchanged, and the different groups continue to be assessed in terms of 'disadvantage' and 'lack', then they are unlikely to ever catch up.(18) Being 'inclusive', Tsolidas makes clear, involves changing what is valued and whose preferences are taken seriously.

On the other hand, this approach too leaves unclear what overall is to be the content of schooling. What, for example, are we to do about the low aspirations and the preferences for informality ('slackness') of the ESB pupils? What could change the patterns of interaction between the groups that Tsolidas identified?

A third framework for considering 'inclusive curriculum' with respect to both gender and ethnicity has been proposed by Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope.(19) Kalantzis and Cope's work has been directly concerned with curriculum and has produced a set of curriculum materials, known collectively as the 'Social Literacy Project'. In brief, their argument is that simply building curriculum on the characteristics of the learners is not possible (given, for example, that 'NESB' conflates many different traditions and needs related to different degrees of language facility, length of stay in Australia, etc.). Nor, they argue, are programmes of 'naive' multiculutralism or naive non-sexist education desirable. 'Naive multiculturalism' which asserts celebration of difference, does not allow for change in women's position in a developing culture. Moreover, in practice it tends to function in schools as a form of marginalization, often channelling NESB groups into utilitarian, 'needs-based' programmes (and certainly promoting the idea that only NESB students have ethnicity). 'Naive' non-sexist education, which simply contests tradition, is inadequate too. It commonly fails to appreciate how some strands of what is promoted under this heading (particular pedagogic practices, for example) are culturally-based, rather than linked necessarily to the preferences and development of all girls and women. And it fails to convey to students any understanding of why cultures have developed particular gender roles and can promote racist judgements as a result.

Kalantzis and Cope argue that an inclusive curriculum is one which has <u>all</u> students undertake a program which encourages them to reflect on how cultures are constructed, and the relation of the individual to their culture and to other individuals:

> if culture is viewed holistically as the process and arrangements by which human needs, emotional, spiritual and material, are satisfied, and daily life is reproduced, then we can critically evaluate how different gender and ethnic practices have developed and how they are maintained, eroded, changed and/or, retrieved. Tradition and heritage then are not simply given and determining in a static way. The fact that there is the possibility of choice of life practices in the Australian context does not fall from the sky, nor does it come from something which we could call Anglo-ness... but from the social structure/culture that has developed to reproduce life in industrial society, which includes independent incomes, liberal education, and so on. Choice is limited insofar as access to these enabling requirements is denied or curtailed.(20)

In contrast to Tsolidas, and in sympathy with Strintzos, Kalantzis and Cope do see girls of NESB background as facing a clash of expectations. Their solution is (1) to make sure students are given necessary language skills; (2) to not take for granted the naturalness of pedagogic approaches such as negotiation, creativity, discussion-based learning, but, if these are thought desirable, to build bridges to these; and (3) to have a mainstream programme, the Social Literacy programme, which allows students to understand their divergent experiences in a common way:

> Multiculturalism and non-sexism should not be soft-options for the self-esteem of the 'disadvantaged' but matters of

intellectual validity and educational rigour for all students. They should be common, inclusive processes.(21)

Gender, Ethnicity and 'Inclusive Curriculum' in Australia: Some Assessments

Although most people working in the area of girls and education have supported the 'inclusive curriculum' approach, some have raised questions about whether this approach represents an incorporation and diversion of demands raised by teachers and others originally concerned with 'non-sexist education'. Just as Bowles and Gintis, Bourdieu and others suggested that in general the liberal rhetoric under which schooling operates was an important mechanism for the reproduction of inequality, some arguments about 'inclusive curriculum' have suggested that this might be an important means of (a) containing the political challenge feminism has posed to knowledge, by implying that reform is simply a matter of addition, of including more things rather than of criticizing existing knowledge and rejecting or transforming it, and (b) weakening the challenge, by emphasizing qualitative rather than quantitative changes and by addressing the qualitative changes in a bland and 'motherhood' term, 'inclusiveness', to which no-one objects but to which adherence can be claimed unattached to any particular concrete changes.(22) In this final section of the paper then I want to consider the implications of the Australian use of the 'inclusive curriculum' concept, both at a policy level, and in terms of the frameworks of research that have been discussed.

First, as policy. Much of the sociological and philosophical literature that has taken a concern with gender and education or a concern with ethnicity and education seriously would imply the desirability of some general re-orientation of curriculum to take up the contributions, concerns and qualities of the previously oppressed/ silenced/ marginalized group. (Consider for example, the work of Gilligan (23), Martin (24) and Clinchy et. al. (25) on gender, or the writings of Apple, Giroux and others on 'emancipatory pedagogy'.) Given that in Australia at least, the issue with gender and ethnicity is less definable in terms of school retention and success and is more a concern with what later understandings, confidence and post-school paths are developed by schooling, a concern with a 'qualitative' form of change in the processes of schooling seems a desirable one. The sociological work however would also interpret State policy in relation to schooling as necessarily concerned with social control and containment, and would suggest that we should look critically at what appear to be progressive policy changes.

In fact the policy concerns with 'inclusiveness' referred to in this paper <u>are</u> clearly contained both in terms of their lack of concrete force on the practices of schools, and by their marginalization in the general sphere of policy development. Although policies may refer to 'inclusiveness', a specific accountability for this or the concrete criteria on which school practice here would be judged have not yet been developed. The <u>National Policy for the Education of Girls</u> of 1987 did call for a reporting cycle whereby States would account for

progress in this area, but nothing concrete has been implemented. The National Policy, produced by a Commission which has now been abolished, is clearly of marginalized concern in relation to current Government policy emphases of national efficiency, education's contribution to Australia's balance of trade and national standards for student learning. Elsewhere (26) I have shown how the government discussions of core curriculum and assessment policies proceed as if 'inclusive curriculum' discussions did not exist. So although the thrust of an 'inclusive curriculum' policy is designed to contest marginalization, this policy itself has been marginalized.

Secondly, what of the 'inclusive curriculum' framework itself? Within feminist theory some writers have argued that the realities of oppression are so different for different groups of women, that to build theories on women as a category invariably builds in racist presumptions. (In Australia, the valuing by Aborigines of men's and women's different authority, the group orientation, the common ownership are all clearly at odds with the traditional competitive norms of schooling as well as the types of role models and career orientation favoured by many programmes concerned with gender inequality.) Other theorists have argued that too much 'seeing things in cultural context' can blind us to the ongoing oppression and exploitation of women across cultures. At the level of Australian policy development, the question has been how a commitment to 'equal opportunity for women' and to 'non-sexist education' (which are commonly allied to certain substantive ideas about women's 'rights' and 'choices', and the importance of developing new career directions for them) go together with a simultaneous commitment to 'multiculturalism' and 'multicultural education' (commonly interpreted as a commitment to preserving and respecting the various cultural heritages of different groups).

In only one area does the Australian policy on gender take a clear stand on the priority or form of interaction of sexism and racism, and this is in the treatment of Aboriginal girls. In the 1987 National Policy for the Education of Girls, as well as in the earlier report on Girls, School and Society it is agreed that priorities in relation to Aboriginal girls should be decided by the National Aboriginal Education Committee (NAEC): in other words that the situation of this most clearly oppressed group relates first to their situation as Aborigines and that self-determination is the priority here. The NAEC agrees that racial rather than gender discrimination is of prime concern and argues that strategies adopted should not be divisive of girls and boys in the Aboriginal community. However, in relation to Australian schooling in general, it supports the need for an 'all inclusive curriculum' which will raise awareness about Aboriginal culture as well as 'result[ing] in equality of educational outcomes'.

The work of Kalantzis and Cope has made clear how much of the talk of 'inclusiveness' fudges the important issue about what view of the world, or what way of critically understanding the world, curriculum should be about. The pedagogical and the curriculum issues of inclusiveness are not identical. Certainly school should be sensitive to the different backgrounds and cultural traditions of

students, but what is taught cannot avoid some perspective on how different backgrounds relate and on what is to be valued. As a number of writers have pointed out, simply retaining a traditional curriculum, but adding in more examples of women or different cultures, does not change the dominant definition of what is important. Equally, having special curricula based on the interests of particular groups can marginalize them. Kalantzis and Cope's solution, the Social Literacy Project, is an approach more in the tradition of MACOS than many other radical approaches to curriculum. Its strength is that it does have a perspective on how concerns about sexism and racism might be addressed together; that it produces materials suitable for a system of public education; and that it is an approach which addresses all students, rather than perpetuating ideas of NESB girls as a special disadvantaged group.

A second issue apparent in the work of both Tsolidas and Kalantzis and Cope is that concerns about inclusiveness embrace not only the understandings of themselves that students get in the course of school, but also the more traditional concerns about success in a competitive system. Given the role of schooling as in part at least a selection mechanism for a society where there are unequal jobs, statuses, power, etc., the concerns here are primarily to avoid strategies which appear to be nice to students of particular groups, but which in effect cut them off from the main paths of educational opportunity. In this respect, it was noted, there is some tension between the sociological attempts to understand more fully the characteristics of different groups (here Strintzos, but more widely known in relation to the earlier work on language codes) and the likely reception of such work by teachers in the field, who are likely to interpret it as disadvantage. In the case of Aboriginal students however where inequality of participation in schooling is so extreme and where a history of cultural difference and cultural domination is so powerful, a case for special treatment remains. Here too however those working in the area acknowledge a problem in that sensitivity to difference can slide into acceptance of 'slackness', lack of progress, etc.

The third aspect of inclusiveness which is raised by a consideration of this Australian work relates to this last point, and to the issue of how change comes about in education. Although it is important for sociologists and curriculum theorists to work further on understanding inequality and what might be a form of good non-sexist, non-racist education, progress comes about too through less than perfect answers which enable people to see things differently. In relation to girls and education I have argued elsewhere how the work of Dale Spender has been useful in this regard, notwithstanding its shortcomings as an analysis of how education works (27). In relation to girls of NESB background, the work of Tsolidas has been similarly important in confronting some of the prevailing taken for granted perspectives on what these girls bring to school.

As a final footnote to the developments discussed in this paper, it might be noted that the political and economic climate which gave support to some work in these areas (however marginalized and contained it might have been) is now changing. Government emphasis

is now heavily on economic priorities, and on what education at all levels can contribute to Australia's balance of trade. A debate critical of migration and of multiculturalism has been renewed in the press and taken up in the political arena. In the state of New South Wales, a new government was elected early in 1988, and among its first acts was the abolition of all funding and personnel tied to programs concerned with Aboriginal education and to girls. The Australian Schools Commission, the body which produced the National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools in 1987 and was a major source of funding for projects in this area was abolished shortly after the launch of this policy.

Notes

1. See L. Yates, 'Australian Research on Gender and Education 1975-1985' in J. Keeves (ed.), Australian Education: Review of Recent Research (Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1987); L. Yates, 'Theorizing Inequality Today', British Journal of Sociology of Education 7 (2) 1986:119-134.

2. On class see my further discussion in 'Theorizing Inequality', op.cit. See also L. Yates, 'Is "Girl-Friendly" Schooling What Girls Really Need?' in J. Whyte, R. Deem, L. Kant and M. Cruikshank (ed.), Girl-Friendly Schooling (Methuen, London, 1985) and L. Yates, 'Women and Education in Australia' in G. Kelly (ed.) International Handbook on Women and Education (Greenwood Press, New York 1989). On race as compared with ethnicity, see my brief discussion in 'Theorizing Inequality' op.cit., n.1. See also, F. Gale et. al., 'Aboriginal Education' in Australian Education, op.cit. For overviews of Australian work on ethnicity and multiculturalism in relation to education see L. Foster and D. Stockley, Multiculturalism: The Changing Australian Paradigm (Multicultural Matters, Clevedon U.K., 1984), and J. J. Smolicz, 'Education for a Multicultural Society' in Australian Education op.cit.

3. L. Yates, 'Does "All Students" Include Girls? Some Reflections on Recent Educational Policy, Practice and Theory', Australian Education Researcher,15 (1), 1988: 41-57.

4. Details of these are given in my review, 'Australian Research...', op.cit.

5. 'Aborigines' is the European term; the term used by Aborigines themselves is 'Koorie' in some states, 'Murri' and 'Nyunga' in others. Eve Fesl of Monash University is currently undertaking a thesis on the racist implications of terms used by Europeans in relation to Australia's indigenous population and argues that the use of the term 'aboriginal' (uncapitalized) was a colonial means of denying these people an identity.

6. See Smolicz, op.cit.; also M. Powles, Women's Participation in Tertiary Education: A Review of Recent Research (2nd edit., Melbourne University CSHE, Melbourne, 1987).

7. See tables in Powles, op.cit.

8. Some similar changes to those described in this section might be noted concerning the treatment of class differences in the two Reports.

9. Girls, School and Society (Report of a Study Group to the Australian Schools Commission, Canberra, 1975): 14.7.

10. Schools Commission, A National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools (Canberra, 1987).

11. See a special section of articles on 'inclusive curriculum' in Curriculum Perspectives 7 (1) 1987.

12. Compare the reviews of research on ethnicity (by Smolicz) and on gender (by Yates), in Keeves, Australian Education, op.cit.

13. 'Does "All students"', op.cit., and 'Theorizing Inequality', op.cit.

14. M. Strintzos, 'To Be Greek Is To Be "Good"' in Cultural Politics, ed. L. Johnson and D. Tyler (University of Melbourne, 1984).

15. Cf. N. Keddie, 'Classroom Knowledge' in Knowledge and Control ed. M. F. D. Young (Cassell & Collier Mac Millan, Oxford, 1971).

16. G. Tsolidas, Educating Voula (MACMME, Melbourne, 1986).

17. G. Tsolidas, 'Girls of Non-English Speaking Background: Implications for an Australian Feminism' in R. Burns and B. Sheehan (ed.) Women and Education (La Trobe University, Bundoora, 1984), and G. Tsolidas, 'Cultural Affirmation: Cultural Approaches' in Including Girls (Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra, 1988).

18. Cf. Keddie, op.cit.; P. Bourdieu and J-P. Passeron, Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture trans. R. Nice (Sage, London, 1977); J. R. Martin, 'Excluding Women From the Educational Realm', Harvard Educational Review, 52 (2), 1982: 133-148; L. Yates, 'The Theory and Practice of Counter-Sexist Education in Schools', Discourse 3 (2), 1983:33-44.

19. M. Kalantzis and B. Cope, 'Cultural Differences, Gender Differences: Social Literacy and Inclusive Education', Curriculum Perspectives 7 (1), 1987: 64-69; M. Kalantzis, 'Aspirations, Participation and Outcomes: From Research to a Curriculum Project for Reform' in Including Girls, op.cit.

20. Kalantzis and Cope, 'Cultural Differences', op.cit., p.65.

21. ibid., p.68.

22. See for example D. Suggett, 'Inclusive Curriculum: A Gain or A Loss for Girls' in Curriculum Perspectives, 7 (1) 1987:69-74; also L. Yates, 'Does "All Girls"', op.cit., and L. Yates, 'Girls and Democratic Schooling' in Including Girls, op.cit.

23. C. Gilligan, 'In a Different Voice: Women's Conception of the Self and Morality', Harvard Education Review, 47 (4), 1977: 481-517.

24. Martin, 'Excluding Women' op.cit.

25. Clinchy, B. McV., et. al., 'Connected Education for Women', Journal of Education (Boston University) 167 (3), 1985: 28-45.

26. 'Does "All Girls"', op.cit.

27. 'Is "Girl-Friendly" Schooling', op.cit.